DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 170 394 UD 019 281

AUTHOR Edmonds, Ron
TITLE A Discussion of the Literature and Issues Related to Effective Schooling.
PUB DATE [79]
NOTE 49p.; Not available in hard copy due to the reproduction quality of the original document; For a related document see UD 019 304

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; Administrator Role; Basic Skills; *Economically Disadvantaged; *Educational Improvement; *Educational Quality; *Effective Teaching; Elementary Secondary Education; *Equal Education; Family Background; Individualized Instruction; Institutional Characteristics; Instructional Improvement; School Community Relationship; School Environment

ABSTRACT

Examined in this paper are the characteristics that distinguish successful schools from unsuccessful schools. Particular attention is given to the instructional success of schools with poor children. An extensive review of related literature illustrates the wide range of opinions held by educators and researchers on the subject. Reference is made to studies and literature dealing with compensatory education programs, school characteristics, and family and social background. Some of the factors discussed and evaluated include school size, teacher experience, teacher's race, teacher salaries, per pupil expenditure, and school facilities. Reference is also made to school studies that are most explicit in identifying and advocating particular changes. Described are certain aspects of school organization, instructional strategies, and school-community dynamics that seem most relevant to achievement gains for poor children. Factors that seem to be the most tangible and indispensible characteristics of effective schools are summarized. Included are such factors as strong administrative leadership, school expectations, school atmosphere, emphasis on basic skills, and frequent monitoring of student progress. (Author/EB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ron Edmonds

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

ED170394

A DISCUSSION OF THE LITERATURE AND ISSUES RELATED TO EFFECTIVE SCHOOLING

Ron Edmonds
Harvard University

I have been asked to prepare this paper in response to the question, "Are there schools that have demonstrated a higher degree of effectiveness in the delivery of instruction in the basic school subjects than others serving similar student populations?" I have also been asked what characteristics distinguish successful from unsuccessful schools and what is the evidence in support of the description of those distinctive characteristics. One would be hard put to conceive of questions more relevant to urban schooling, thus no doubt making the reader anxious to know what the research literature has to say in response to these important questions. I will in due course discuss the research literature relevant to these questions but I want first to say something of the premises from which this discussion will proceed.

It seems only fair that the reader know what biases, if any, inform the 'summary' remarks I plan to make. Equity will be the focus of my discussion. I mean by equity a simple sense of fairness in the distribution of the primary goods and services that characterize our social order. Some of us, rightly, have more goods and services than others and my sense of equity is not disturbed by that fact. Others of us have almost no goods and access to only the most wretched services and that deeply offends my simple sense of fairness and hence violates the standard of equity by which I judge our social order.

UD019281

I measure our progress as a social order by our willingness to advance the equity interests of the least among us. Thus increased wealth or education for the top of our social order is quite beside the point of my basis for assessing our progress toward greater equity. Progress requires public policy that begins by making the poor less poor and ends by making them not poor at all. This discussion of education will apply just such a standard to public schooling. Equitable public schooling begins by teaching poor children what their parents want them to know and ends by teaching poor children at least as well as it teaches middle-class children.

Inequity in American education derives first and foremost from our failure to educate the children of the poor. Education in this context refers to primary pupil acquisition of those basic school skills which assure successful pupil access to the next level of schooling. If that seems too modest a standard, note that as of now the schools that teach the children of the poor are dismal failures even by such a modest standard. Thus to raise up a generation of children whose schools meet such a standard would be an equity advance of the first order. I offer this standard at the outset to note that its attainment is far more a matter of politics than of social science. Social science refers to those formal experiments and inquiries carried out by sociologists, psychologists, educational researchers and other academicians which inquiries are described as seeking the relationship between school characteristics, pupil performance, pupil family background, and pupil social class. Politics refers

to the substantive and procedural bases for deciding the distribution of educational resources, defining the uses to which the schools are to be put and establishing the criteria by which school personnel are to be evaluated.

It is in such a context that I define an effective school as being instructionally successful for all children.

Specifically I require that an effective school bring the children of the poor to those minimal masteries of basic school skills that now describe minimally successful pupil performance for the children of the middle-class.

My subsequent discussion of certain of the literature on school effects must not be taken to mean that whether or not schools are effective derives from matters of research or social science. Such is not the case. Schools teach those they think they must and when they think they needn't they don't. That fact has nothing to do with social science except that the children of social scientists are among those that schools feel compelled to effectively teach.

There has never been a time in the life of the American public school when we have not known all that we needed to teach all those that we chose to teach. The discussion of research literature that follows may illuminate that fact but it cannot change it.

For our purposes the literature on school effects begins with Coleman.[1] That is so for two reasons. First, our interest in school effects is focused on cognitive gain for the children of

the poor. Pupil cognitive gain became a measure of school effectiveness only in very recent years and Coleman was instrumenatal in effecting that change.[2]

Until early in the 20th century public schools were judged almost exclusively on the basis of their ability to teach those behaviors and attitudes that prepared young people for compliant participation in the work force. More importantly, schools sorted young people into social, interest, aptitude, and ability groups that were a virtual mirror image of the stratified American social order.[3] Such sorting, then and now, is of inestimable value in persuading young people to accept the pervasive inequities that describe our social order. In sum, the late 19th and early 20th century public school was expected to respond to a multitude of social problems none of which were assessed in terms that included pupil cognitive gain.[4] As Ralph Tyler (77) has noted American educators saw no need for large scale school studies till the Great Depression drove a large and heterogeneous adolescent population into our secondary schools.[4a] "The Eight Year Study" was an attempt to assess how schools were handling the new arrivals and was the beginning of our effort to use social science in coping with a newly disparate secondary public school population.

Throughout the 30's and 40's our schools grew increasingly heterogeneous. In the decades of the 1940's and 50's our public rhetoric on schooling as an instrument of democracy grew increasingly bold and finally in the mid 50's racially segregated public schools were declared unconstitutional. So aggressively democratic had our rhetoric become that in 1964 the Congress passed a "Civil Rights Act" whose purpose was to help

fulfill the loftiest ideals of American democracy. Largely in response to the Civil Rights Act the Congress commissioned Prof. James Coleman to undertake a national "Equal Educational Opportunity Survey" (EEOS) which brings us back to the Coleman with whom we began this aside. It may well be that Coleman's only lasting contribution to educational equity lies in his popularizing of pupil cognitive gain as the measure of school effectiveness. Most earlier school studies had focused on pupil access to educational resources with little attention to the pupil performance consequences of that access.

The second reason our discussion of school effects begins with Coleman has to do with the EEOS's unprecedented impact on the public perception of the nature of public schooling. As initially commissioned the EEOS was to assess the distribution of educational resources by race. Armed with these descriptive data the EEOS would then generally assess equality of educational opportunity in our public schools.

With little fanfare at the time (July 3, 1966), Coleman and his colleagues reported a number of findings whose public acceptance still constitute formidable obstacles to advancing educational equity. First, the EEOS reported that relatively speaking, black pupils had access to educational resources that were very nearly equal to the resources to which white pupils had access which made our schools seem more egalitarian than they were thought to be at the time. More importantly, Coleman reported that despite black pupil access to school resources nearly equal to white, black pupil performance was substantially below white

pupil performance and the difference seemed to be caused by pupil family background. Coleman made a similar observation about performance differences between affluent children and poor children. These findings taken together seemed to be saying that how well children did in school had little to do with the schools themselves.

> ...schools bring little influence to bear on a child's achievement that is independent of his background and general social context; ...this very lack of an independent effect means that the inequalities imposed on children by their home, neighborhood and peer environment are carried along to become the inequalitites with which they confront adult life at the end of school. For equality of educational opportunity must imply a strong effect of schools that is independent of the child's immediate social environment, and that strong independent effect i- not present in American schools (Coleman, et al, 1966, p. 325.)

In contemplating Coleman's summary remarks, remember that there is a formidable body of literature that is highly critical of Coleman's methodological design for EEOS. (Armour, 1972[5]; Bowles and Levin, 1972[6]; Cain and Watts, 1970[7]; Hanushek and Kain, 1972[8]; Jencks, 1972[9]; Smith, 1972[10]; etc.). Given the devastating character of certain of the Coleman critiques one is tempted to ask how came such a flawed analysis to pervasive influence on the American discourse on educational equity. My own view is that political climate bends social science to its will, and that social science evidence in and of

itself whether good evidence or bad evidence is seldom the primary basis of public policy. The EEOS assault on school reform as an instrument of equity coincided with a political climate ill-disposed to further serve the interests of the least among us given Nixon's attitude toward certain of the Johnson domestic initiatives. This becomes especially clear when one remembers that between '66 and '72 relatively little attention was paid to the EEOS. It remained for Mr. Nixon's leprechaun Pat Moynihan to loudly herald the anti-poor uses to which the EEOS might be put. It is Moynihan as much as any public figure who in the early Nixon years orchestrated the argument that the poor are characterized by intrinsic disabilities that account for their low standing in our hierarchical social order. Moynihan's argument goes on to conclude that school reform is wasted on the poor since only massive intervention in the life of the poor will ameliorate the intrinsic disabilities from which they suffer. Mr. Nixon's silent majority was pleased to hear that they needn't share their treasures since the poor were undeserving and Mr. Nixon was pleased to be told that "benign neglect" was probably more than the wretches deserved. Obviously in such a discourse those responsible for teaching the children of the poor needn't fear being held to closer instructional account since according to COLEMAN AND MOYNIHAN one school was expected to be about as unsuccessful as another when trying to teach the children of the poor. Such is the nature of the politics of social scientists.

Despite that the reader must not be left to believe that there is no social science evidence in support of school characteristics as principal determinants of pupil performance. There is,

of course, the substantial literature on absolute school effects. Gordon[11](1923), Green et al[12] (1966), Wheeler[13](1942) and others have shown the dramatic differences in cognitive gain between children who attend school as compared to those who do not. By and large these studies do not control for social class but they do establish that as a group children who go to school get a good deal "smarter" than those who do not. Now comes the more particular question, if "smarter" is what you want your children to be does it matter whether you send them to one school as compared to another particularly if you and your children are poor. Coleman says no but Mayeske et al[14] (1972) State of New York Office of Education[15] (1974), Weber[16] (1971), Averch et al[17] (1972) Rist[18] (1970), Brophy and Good[19] (1970) and many others have said yes.

Mayeske and his colleagues have concluded that "...for low SES schools the school variables played a greater independent role than the student body variables." (Mayeske et al.,1972, p.67). The State of New York (1974) and Weber (1971) have both identified and studied instructionally effective inner city schools serving predominantly poor pupil populations. In each instance the author's concluded that school characteristics were the principal determinants of the instructional effectiveness of the schools they studied as contrasted with instructionally ineffective schools serving demographically analogous pupil populations. One of the studies that comes closest to the whole truth of school effects is Averch et al (1972) whose work is a summary overview of the evidence on school effects available at the time. Averch and his colleagues concluded that accurate assessment of school effects

required an examination of pupil performance partly on the basis of pupil membership in different social class sub sets. Rist (1970) had earlier noted the interaction between pupil social class, teacher expectations, and levels of pupil performance. Brophy and Good (1970) had verified Rist by concluding that "...studies of long-term trends in teacher effectiveness must designate which kinds of students the teacher is effective with, as well as how effective he is (p.60)".

I should note in passing that the Edmonds, Frederiksen[20] (1978) study of effective schools is designed so as to reflect the methodological lessons taught by each of these studies. More on that later. The summary point is that those who are disposed to democratic and egalitarian public policy ON EDUCATION can find quite adequate social science evidence in support of such policy. We've already seen that there is ample evidence for the contrary view.

I would be pleased to stop this recitation here to report that citizen's having seen that social science is ill-suited to be instrumental in making good educational policy had taken it upon themselves to make educational decisions quite independent of social science and social scientists thus precluding further literature to confound these issues.

Such alas is not the case: at a 1973 conference at the Harvard Graduate School of Education, the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement[21] (IEA) reported the results of a very large and ambitious study of school effects in 22 countries. More than half the countries whose schools were studied were in Europe and the British Isles but the remainder were scattered throughout the world and included

Australia, Chile, India, Iran, Israel, Japan, New Zealand, Thailand and the United States. Standardized achievement tests were specially constructed for the project. The tests measured pupil performance in mathematics, science, reading, literature, civics, and French and English as foreign languages. Questionnaires and other devices were used to obtain background and environmental data on tested pupils. The IEA sought the origin of pupil performance differences between different countries, different schools, and different pupils. Like Coleman's EEOS, the IEA study concluded that family background was the greatest single cause of variation in pupil performance whether that variation occurred country to country, school to school, or pupil to pupil.

These summary remarks cannot of course do justice to the extraordinary richness of the IEA data. Walker[22] (1975) for example has noted that the IEA data show much stronger independent school effects in poorer countries than in richer countries. I heartily encourage the student of these matters to peruse the IEA data but also want to introduce certain very substantial cautions. I first delivered the remarks that follow at the 1973 IEA conference at Harvard. The text was subsequently published in Purves and Levine's Educational Policy and International Assessment. (1975)

> Such contacts as I have had with IEA personnel show them to be men and women of substance and merit. I am therefore doubly pained at having to take such strong exception to their ambitious undertaking. I hope it is understood, however, that my criticism is offered in a mood of amiability and cooperation in the belief that the IEA beginnings might eventually yield greater policy gain than is now the case.

The IEA inquiry in general and Professor Thorndike's work in particular confirm a portion of conventional educational wisdom that is mischievous at least and pernicious in certain of the uses to which it is put. Conventional educational wisdom, in the United States, endorses manipulation of children and their environment whenever children are judged unacceptably deviant from our ethnocentric norms. The opportunity for mischief is obvious in such a circumstance. We grow pernicious when our rationale for intervention extends to defining large groups of people as "culturally deprived" by reason of their cultural or linguistic deviation from our norms. The IEA study lends itself to such abuse.

That the IEA work confirms Coleman and similar researchers was probably predictable from the moment its overall plan was developed. That is so because these inquiries occurred within political and ideological parameters that precluded insight into certain profound questions that remain about education in general and public schooling in particular.

The IEA decided, at the outset, to seek information on pupils and learning as opposed to schools and teaching. Only one of the six "areas of inquiry" is devoted to explicit information on school characteristics. Areas of inquiry are a researcher's prerogative and ought not ordinarily be contested, but mischief occurs here because the "areas" are described as "predictors of accomplishment." That means the IEA proceeded from certain premises that coincide with the conventional wisdom I mentioned earlier. In summary, I infer those premises to be: first, educational assessment is a normative process, and the researcher can use his own judgment in establishing or ascertaining the norm; second, pupil performance on standardized measures is a reasonable indicator of academic ability and general intelligence; third, pupil characteristics both predict and delimit academic performance; and, finally and most importantly, the responsibility for educational outcomes rests primarily with pupils and their parents as opposed to schools and their teachers.

Taken together such premises predict at least two outcomes for educational assessment: schools serve pupils well or poorly in conformity to the social and economic status of the pupils; middle-class pupils are well served, and poor pupils are not.

Such an observation is not liable to contest, and our disagreement concerns, therefore, the questions to be asked in response to the predicted outcome. Let me suggest certain questions the answers to which would have unambiguous policy implications alternative to prevailing practice among most of the school systems that are a part of the IEA study. What is the relationship between pupil performance and the origin of the uses to which the school is to be put? What is the relationship between pupil performance and the school's perceptions of parents and pupils as clients, or constituents, or both? What is the relationship between pupil performance and assessment on the basis of central normative, or local criterion, measures? Is a school a social-service setting, and, if so, is pupil performance the principal responsibility of the family or the school?

I am not suggesting that the IEA inquiry could have answered such questions. I am critical because there is little to suggest that the IEA was interested in such questions. Not to be interested is a measure of the parameters of the inquiry, its reporting, and its policy implications.

The whole of the IEA inquiry is cast in a different light by altering certain of the a priori positions that inform the work. In the "General Summary" Thorndike concludes "a dominant determiner of the outcome from a school in terms of reading performance is the input in terms of the kinds of students that go to the school." Using the same data that brought Thorndike to that observation I would say that a dominant determiner of the outcome from a school in terms of reading performance is the input in terms of the school's response to the kinds of students that go to the school.

Such an alternative observation illustrates the core of our disagreement. In assessing public schooling, I place the greatest burden on the schools as opposed to the pupils.

The central question for each of us is how best to respond to the relationship between the pupil's social and economic status and his performance. The implication in the IEA work is that one must intervene in the life of the child so as to convey to him the behavior and characteristics the schools regard as prerequisite to successful performance. The data, freed from its political and ideological parameters, might well suggest that what is wanted is intervention in the life of the school so as to compel a more effective instructional response to those who profit least from prevailing arrangements.

The present study says little of how schooling might be made more equitable. Neither does it say such an effort is inappropriate or that it might not yield gains that would profit us all.

In addition to answering the questions I have already suggested, researchers must alter the inferred premises that characterize the IEA study in order to effect greater educational equity.

Educational assessment requires that the criteria to be used be defined. When a researcher feels free to use normative measures, he has established that the normative criteria are acceptable to the most powerful people in the educational community being assessed. He has also established that if these criteria do not coincide with the expectations of some pupils and their parents it will be of no consequence because such parents will be impotent in their contest of the assessment. Such authority relations are illustrative of inequitable institutional responses to heterogeneous populations. In such a context data on pupil performance that is a function of income and social class ought to give a researcher serious cause for questioning a priori assumptions about "predictors of accomplishment."

The intelligence quotient and standardized measures are further illustrative of the authority relations in schooling. Both kinds of instruments permit the researcher to define for himself what constitutes ability and intelligence. If intelligence is defined as effective

functioning in a society and ability as one's proficiency at certain tasks, it is important to know the relationship between the pupil behaviors being recorded and their relationship to the aspirations and culture of the pupil and his family. Thus, the IEA instruments were more reliable when they were recording the behaviors of pupils who share and accept the norm that schooling represents in this inquiry.

Variations in the background of the pupil need not predict his performance. They may do so because schools usually share the society's inequitable and discriminatory response to the poor and others who are disadvantaged. The Welsh in England, blacks in America, and the poor everywhere illustrate the ethnocentrism that usually characterizes school response to differences that are not valued by the schools. In such a circumstance data on pupil performance must be treated carefully to avoid inferring an equity in schooling that may not exist.

The political and ideological implications of all educational assessment may be best illustrated by consideration of the social-service definition of schooling that is to be used. Data related to performance are of no help. The definition to be used is a function of one's perspective and disposition.

Schools must serve pupils and their parents. Data concerning performance thus assess the effectiveness of the school. Ineffective schools must be altered in conformity to pupil characteristics and parental expectations. It is my hope that future IEA inquiries are more explicitly directed to the tasks defined by this critique.

The next large body of evaluative literature to be discussed has to do with compensatory education programs. It is probably safe to say that the material here is sufficiently disparate to support either side of the argument on whether pupil performance derives principally from pupil family background or school characteristics. The USOE (1970)[23], (1975)[24], and Westinghouse[25] have carried out very large studies and concluded that as a national strategy of educational equity compensatory education has failed largely because it is unable to overcome the obstacles described by the family backgrounds of the Title I and Head Start pupils. There were critics[26], as in the controversy surrounding the EEOS, who contended that the USOE and Westinghouse studies were fatally flawed

by virtue of methodological error, political constraint, and ideological bias.

No matter; our purposes are better served by noting a literature that affirmatively concludes that for all its limitations compensatory education is capable of bringing poor children to levels of cognitive gain that more than justify the billions thus far spent on Title I and Head Start. Cornell University's Consortium on Developmental Continuity under the leadership of Irving Lazar is now engaged in evaluating the long-term educational outcomes of pupil participation in certain of the orginal federally funded compensatory education programs.[27] Lazar and his colleagues have found that over time pupils in compensatory education programs "score higher on achievement tests" and "benefit from sleeper effects..." compared to a SES matched group of pupils who did not participate in compensatory education programs. Moreover, the compensatory education pupils show more rapid rise in average IQ scores and the IQ gains last four years or more after completion of the compensatory education programs.

Having confounded easy perspective on the instructional efficacy of compensatory education, we come now to the "piece de resistance" of the neo-conservative, psuedo-scientific effort to deny the educability of children who are poor, of color, or both. In 1972 C. Jencks and a group of Harvard colleagues published Inequality[28], an analysis of the interaction between education, income, and social class. Jencks and his colleagues concluded that the American inequities of income and social class were very nearly independent of educational inequities. School reform was

therefore rejected as an instrument of equity. Jencks ended the book by advising that nothing short of direct income redistribution was likely to have an appreciable effect on American inequality. From our point of view the most devastating Jencks' conclusion was that "We cannot blame economic inequality on differences between schools, since differences between schools seem to have very little effect on any measurable attribute of those who attend them." (Jencks et al, 1972, p.8).

If true such a conclusion must certainly be discouraging for those educational decision-makers who see advancing equity as part of their public service mission. I have elsewhere remarked on the substance of Inequality and on rereading see no reason to change what I've already said.

Analysis of Jencks's conclusions about schooling might be helped by reference to specific statements in the book.

> . . . children with affluent parents want more education than children with poor parents. . . . those who want a lot should get a lot and those who want very little should get very little. The same is true of knowledge and cognitive skills. (p. 11)

Jencks makes no effort to explain why, by grade 9, affluent children express greater preference for schooling than poor children. Many among those of us who have worked in schools know that schools share the larger society's distaste for the poor. By grade 9, the average poor child has not acquired the basic school skills that are prerequisite to successful matriculation. By grade 9, the cultural autocracy that characterizes schools has persuaded the average poor child that the school doesn't like him, or his condition, except as he is prepared to behave in ways that make him seem affluent. By grade 9, many poor children are less than enthusiastic about school largely because they have learned little in relationship to what should be taught and because the school milieu is culturally responsive to the affluent, which is another way of saying it is anti-poor.

Survey data that describe the affluent preference for schooling do not justify the observation that "those who want a lot [of education] should get a lot." The data would justify such an observation only if they were collected in a school that was responsive to the poor in many of the same ways that schools are responsive to the affluent. Jencks's inference that poor children don't want to learn anything because they don't know anything is characteristic of opinion makers who do not accept the public schools' obligation to serve all who come.

. . . variations in what children learn in school depend largely on variations in what they bring to school, not on variations in what schools offer them. (p. 53)

This statement is based on Jencks's acceptance of compensatory education as a legitimate educational effort to better serve students who are not well served. The fallacy of his conclusion is a function of his ignorance of the educational pathology that is compensatory education. Compensatory education makes the child responsible for learning to learn in the ways that the school is prepared to teach. As an educational strategy, compensatory education doesn't work because it doesn't make the school responsible for teaching in the ways that the children are prepared to learn. This conflict of teaching and learning style is a further manifestation of the cultural autocracy that characterizes the schools' response to children who don't behave as though they are affluent and white.

A varied response to what children bring to school would necessitate understanding, appreciating, accepting, and responding to the variety of cultures pupils represent. No such varied response has occurred, except in rare and fledgling instances of minority community control of public schooling. Therefore, Jencks has no substantive basis for his conclusion since public schools do not vary substantially in what they offer children who are unacceptable by reason of cultural difference.

We can see no evidence that either school administrators or educational experts know how to raise test scores. . . . Certainly we do not know how to do so. (p. 93)

Despite the disclaimers, Jencks's statement intends the reader to conclude that schools are, and have been, doing the best they can. Dissatisfaction among black and poor parents can therefore be ignored. In summary, Jencks is asking us to hold parents responsible for the quality of their children's schooling since the schools can effectively teach only children who have certain cultural and behavioral characteristics.

This is another instance in which Jencks's disposition prompts him to conclude that if he lacks the will or intelligence to identify effective school reform it is because effective school reform isn't possible.

We hasten to point out to Jencks that public schools are not now, nor have they ever been, committed to the radical notion that they are obliged to teach certain minimal school skills (reading, writing, and computation) to all pupils who are free of certifiable handicap. Those who wish to test the point have only to approach the nearest school and ask to read the goals of the institution. Then ask whether the goals ever included teaching all elementary pupils basic school skills. The answers will be multiple and varied but negative. Jencks and his predecessors have used their wizardry to convey the notion that children who do not learn in conformity to the schools' teaching are themselves responsible for their failure. *Until public schools are held responsible for responding to children rather than the other way round, no test of public instruction will have occurred.* In the absence of such a test of public schooling, Jencks cannot substantiate his assertion that educators don't know how to raise test scores.

The effects of segregation on test scores are certainly not large enough to justify overriding the preferences of parents and children. (p. 106)

Insofar as Jencks recommends that black parents not be coerced into integration we support him. Insofar as Jencks recommends that black parents be accepting of segregation, we oppose him.

Inequality's intermittent references to black children are of a piece in the sense that Jencks's predecessors and colleagues conceived of "compensatory education" as an instrument of integration. Black children, in the "war on poverty," were to be "compensated" for being black by being taught to behave as though they were affluent whites. Having been so taught, they would then be ready to learn in conformity to the schools' style of teaching. Many blacks have seen the perils of integration thus defined. Schools have used "compensatory education" as a further instrument of cultural autocracy. Therefore Jencks's analysis of black pupil performance ignores the origin of the phenomenon he is analyzing.

> . . . even if we reorganized the schools so that their primary concern was for the student who most needed help, there is no reason to suppose that adults would end up appreciably more equal as a result. (p. 255)

There are at least two basic flaws in this conclusion. Jencks believes that those who "need help" don't score well on standardized tests. Schools in which large numbers of pupils don't score well are bad schools in the sense that they don't teach well. To talk about "help" for the pupils avoids the more obvious response which is to "help" the school.

The second flaw in Jencks's conclusion is his failure to understand the relationship between schooling and the social order's perception of "equality." Our society's perception of "equality" is ethnocentric. That means that high income will not make an individual equal unless that individual has habits of speech, appearance, and behavior that conform to society's ethnocentric notions. Culturally autocratic schools effectively teach ethnocentrism. Selective teaching of reading, writing, and computation is a manifestation of cultural autocracy and helps to sustain ethnocentrism. Jencks's preoccupation with income as the vehicle and measure of social equality reveals his inability to understand this.

Income is valuable insofar as it buys individual choices. Income cannot buy societal appreciation of individual worth, or group cohesion, or community, in a society that is characterized by racism, materialism, and inhumanity. Jencks's repudiation of schooling as an instrument of social improvement is valid only if one accepts income as the end toward which we strive. [29]

The summary point of these criticisms is that Inequality is a highly flawed discussion of the interaction between education, income, and social class. My own conclusion is that as a policy guide Inequality can safely be ignored. It has a sufficient mix of error and wrong-headedness so that it is principally misleading in its discussion of the interaction between education and inequality.

Up to now my overall purpose has been to show that the large studies of school effects are not particularly useful to the educational decision maker who must organize and administer particular instructional programs. Coleman, Moynihan, Jencks and their colleagues make interesting and sometimes thoughtful reading but as a guide to the teacher or school administrator their work is of very little help.

Therefore let us turn now to that portion of the literature that is rather more particular in focus and purpose and therefore more likely to aid in the planning and implementation of program. We can begin by noting that there is ample evidence to justify ignoring a number of school characteristics when our object is instructional reform. First, unless extreme change (less than 15 pupils , more than 35) is being considered, class size, in and of itself, is not a critical variable in determining pupil performance.[30] Class size must of course be considered in any overall instructional strategy but the point is that no appeciable gain in pupil acquisition of basic school skills can be got solely on the basis of a reduction in class size. Let me make clear that for most instructional purposes I prefer small classes to large classes. I recommend small classes for reasons of classroom amiability, ease of management, improved teacher morale and a variety of other important educational interests. Small class size cannot however be recommended on the basis of a research literature that predicts greater pupil achievement as a consequence of reduced class size. Similar remarks can be made about school size, teacher experience, teacher's race, teacher's salaries, per pupil expenditure and school

facilities.[31] All of these school characteristics are important in a variety of ways for a variety of reasons, but no one of them can be successfully manipulated when the object is greater pupil acquistion of basic school skills.

In this quick summary of the research on school characteristics not directly and singly related to pupil performance I have saved racial composition of the building for last on the grounds that this volatile and important issue deserves more than hasty discussion.

Court ordered desegregation is the greatest weapon in the black arsenal of civic power. Since 1954 several score American cities have been profoundly altered as a consequence of black initiated court ordered desegregation of the local school district.[32] The history of these class action suits is that they occur as a tactical last resort by a black community that has tried for many years by various means to improve teaching and learning for black children.[33] In fact, school desegregation can best be understood when evaluated principally as an instrument of instructional reform.[34] The literature on desegregation is not, for the most part, organized this way but to be most useful to educational decision-makers should be used this way. Taken as a whole the research literature says that in and of itself desegregation has little effect on pupil performance.[35] Desegregation is however a unique opportunity to effect educational changes that could not otherwise occur. What must therefore be carefully thought through are those educational changes that will yield the greatest instructional gain for that portion of the

pupil population in which we have the greatest interest; those who profit least from existing arrangements. Thus when and if desegregation comes bringing with it a unique opportunity for institutional change we will be well prepared to seize the occasion on behalf of a set of reforms that represent the most auspicious use of the circumstances. When planning the actual desegregation we need to know whether to advocate racial balance, educational parks, a Princeton plan or some other variation explicitly intended to effect the greatest educational gain.

We come now to those school studies that are most explicit in identifying and advocating particular changes. What follows is a discussion of certain aspects of school organization, instructional strategy and school community dynamic that seem most directly relevant to achievement gains for poor children.

Weber was an early contributor to the literature on the school determinants of achievement in his 1971 study of four instructionally effective inner city schools.[36] Weber intended his study to be explicitly alternative to Coleman, Jensen,[37] and other researchers who had satisfied themselves that low achievement by poor children derived principally from inherent disabilities that characterized the poor. Weber focused on the characteristics of four inner city schools in which reading achievement was clearly successful for poor children on the basis of national norms. All four schools have "strong leadership" in that their principal is instrumental in: setting the tone of the school; helping decide on instructional strategies; and organizing and distributing the schools resources. All four schools have "high expectations" for

all their students. Weber is careful to point out that high expectations are not sufficient for school success but they are certainly necessary. All four schools have an orderly, relatively quiet, and pleasant atmosphere. All four schools strongly emphasize pupil acquisition of reading skills and reinforce that emphasis by careful and frequent evaluation of pupil progress.

Weber goes on to identify and discuss additional reading personnel, phonics, and individualization as important to the instructional success of the four schools. I'll not endorse or pursue these latter Weber findings: first because subsequent research does not sustain their relevance as it does leadership, expectations, atmosphere, reading emphasis, and assessment; and second my own research, of which more will be said later, gives greater weight to the first mentioned variables than the latter. Despite these reservations my own view is that Weber was essentially correct both in concept and basic research design considering the relative modesty of his enterprise.

In 1974, the New York State Office of Education Performance Review published a study[38] that confirmed certain of Weber's major findings. New York identified two inner city New York City public schools, both of which were serving an analogous, predominantly poor pupil population. One of the schools was high-achieving and the other was low-achieving. Both schools were studied in an attempt to identify those differences that seemed most responsible for the achievement variation between the two schools. The following findings were reported.

"This study showed that:

-- the differences in student performance in these two schools seemed to be attributed to factors under the schools' control;

-- administrative behavior, policies and practices in the schools appeared to have a significant impact on school effectiveness;

-- the more effective inner city school was led by an administrative team which provided a good balance between both management and instructional skills;

-- the administrative team in the more effective school had developed a plan for dealing with the reading problem and had implemented the plan throughout the school;

-- classroom reading instruction did not appear to differ between the two schools since classroom teachers in both schools had problems in teaching reading and assessing pupils' reading skills;

-- many professional personnel in the less effective school attributed childrens' reading problems to nonschool factors and were pessimistic about their ability to have an impact, creating an environment in which children failed because

they were not expected to succeed. However, in the more effective school, teachers were less skeptical about their ability to have an impact on children;

-- children responded to unstimulating learning experiences predictably -- they were apathetic, disruptive or absent.

Admittedly this study has not identified all factors relating to student reading achievement. However, these preliminary findings are consistent with a significant body of other research. While more research should be encouraged, it is even more important that we begin to apply what is already known.

This study has shown that school practices have an effect on reading achievement. At the very least, the children in low achieving schools should have the opportunities available to the children of the high achieving schools. These opportunities, which do not result from higher overall expenditures, are clearly within the reach of any school today."[39]

For our purposes these findings reinforce the relevance of leadership, expectations, and atmosphere as essential institutional elements affecting pupil performance. If further evidentiary support for these findings is wanted the reader is invited to close scrutiny of the 1976 Madden, Lawson, Sweet study of school effectiveness in California.[40] In a more rigorous and

sophisticated version of the Weber and New York studies Madden and his colleagues studied 21 pairs of California elementary schools matched on the basis of pupil characteristics and differing only on the basis of pupil performance on standardized achievement measures. The 21 pairs of schools were studied in an effort to identify those institutional characteristics that seemed most responsible for the achievement differences that described the 21 high-achieving schools and the 21 low-achieving schools. The major findings are ten.

"1. In comparison to teachers at lower-achieving schools, teachers at higher-achieving schools report that their principals provide them with a significantly greater amount of support.

2. Teachers in higher-achieving schools were more task-oriented in their classroom approach and exhibited more evidence of applying appropriate principles of learning than did teachers in lower-achieving schools.

3. In comparison to classrooms in lower-achieving schools, classrooms in higher-achieving schools provided more evidence of student monitoring processes, student effort, happier children, and atmosphere conducive to learning.

4. In comparison to teachers at lower-achieving schools, teachers at higher-achieving schools reported that they spent relatively more time on social studies, less time on mathematics and physical education/health, and about the

same amount of time on reading/language development and science.

5. In contrast to teachers at lower-achieving schools, teachers at higher-achieving schools report:

a. A larger number of adult volunteers in mathematics classes;

b. Fewer paid aides in reading; and

c. They are more apt to use teacher aides for nonteaching tasks, such as classroom paperwork, watching children on the playground, and maintaining classroom discipline.

6. In comparison to teachers at lower-achieving schools, teachers at higher-achieving schools reported higher levels of access to "outside the classroom" materials.

7. In comparison to the teachers of lower-achieving schools, teachers at higher-achieving schools believed their faculty as a whole had less influence on educational decisions.

8. In comparison to teachers at lower-achieving schools, teachers at higher-achieving schools rated district administration higher on support services.

9. In comparison to grouping practices at lower-achieving schools, the higher-achieving schools divided classrooms into fewer groups for purposes of instruction.

10. In comparison to teachers in lower-achieving schools, teachers in higher-achieving schools reported being more satisfied with various aspects of their work." [41]

My own conclusion is that aside from intrinsic merit the California study is chiefly notable for its reinforcement of leadership, expectations, atmosphere, and instructional emphasis as consistently essential institutional determinants of pupil performance.

I want to close this part of the discussion with summary remarks about a recent and unusually persuasive study of school effects. In 1977 W.B. Brookover and L.W. Lezotte published their study of "Changes In School Characteristics Coincident With Changes In Student Achievement"[42]. We should take special note of this work partly because it is a formal extension of inquiries and analyses begun in two earlier studies both of which reinforce certain of the Weber, Madden, et al, and New York findings. The Michigan Department of Education "Cost Effectiveness Study"[43] and the Brookover et al study of "Elementary School Climate and School Achievement"[44] are both focused on those educational variables that are liable to school control and important to the quality of pupil performance. In response to both of these studies the Michigan Department of Education asked Brookover and Lezotte to study a set of Michigan schools characterized by consistent pupil performance improvement or decline. The Brookover, Lezotte study is broader in scope than the two earlier studies and explicitly intended to profit from methodological and analytical lessons

learned in the "Cost Effectiveness..." and "Elementary School Climate..." studies. Since the early 70's the Michigan Department of Education has annually tested all Michigan pupils in public schools in grades four and seven. The tests are criterion referenced standardized measures of pupil performance in basic school skills. Over time these data were used by the Michigan Department of Education to identify elementary schools characterized by consistent pupil performance improvement or decline. Brookover and Lezotte chose eight of those schools to be studied (6 improving, 2 declining). The schools were visited by trained interviewers who conducted interviews and administered questionnaires to a great many of the school personnel. The interviews and questionnaires were designed to identify differences between the improving and declining schools, which differences seemed most important to the pupil performance variation between the two sets of schools. The summary results follow.

1. The improving schools are clearly different from the declining schools in the emphasis their staff places on the accomplishment of the basic reading and mathematics objectives. The improving schools accept and emphasize the importance of these goals and objectives while declining schools give much less emphasis to such goals and do not specify them as fundamental.

2. There is a clear contrast in the evaluations that teachers and principals make of the students in the improving and declining schools. The staffs of the improving schools tend to believe that all of their students can master the basic objectives; and furthermore, the teachers perceive that the principal shares this belief. They tend to report higher and increasing levels of student ability, while the declining school teachers project the belief that students' ability levels are low and, therefore, they cannot master even these objectives.

3. The staff of the improving schools hold decidedly higher and apparently increasing levels of expectations with regard to the educational accomplishments of their students. In contrast, staff of the declining schools are much less likely to believe that their students will complete high school or college.

4. In contrast to the declining schools, the teachers and principals of the improving schools are much more likely to assume responsibility for teaching the basic reading and math skills and are much more committed to doing so. The staffs of the declining schools feel there is not much that teachers can do to influence the achievement of their students. They tend to displace the responsibility for skill learning on the parents or the students themselves.

5. Since the teachers in the declining schools believe that there is little they can do to influence basic skill learning, it follows they spend less time in direct reading instruction than do teachers in the improving schools. With the greater emphasis on reading and math objectives in the improving schools, the staffs in these schools devote a much greater amount of time toward achieving, reading, and math objectives.

6. There seems to be a clear difference in the principal's role in the improving and declining schools. In the improving schools, the principal is more likely to be an instructional leader, be more assertive in his instructional leadership role, is more of a disciplinarian and perhaps most of all, assumes responsibility for the evaluation of the achievement of basic objectives. The principals in the declining schools appear to be permissive and to emphasize informal and collegial relationships with the teachers. They put more emphasis on general public relations and less emphasis upon evaluation of the school's effectiveness in providing a basic education for the students.

7. The improving school staffs appear to evidence a greater degree of acceptance of the concept of accountability and are further along in the development of an accountability model. Certainly they accept the MEAP tests as one indication of their effectiveness to a much greater degree than the declining school staffs. The latter tend to reject the relevance of the MEAP tests and make little use of these assessment devices as a reflection of their instruction. (MEAP refers to Michigan Educational Assessment Program).

8. Generally, teachers in the improving schools are less satisfied than the staffs in the declining schools. The higher levels of reported staff satisfaction and morale in the declining schools seem to reflect a pattern of complacency and satisfaction with the current levels or educational attainment. On the other hand, the improving school staffs appear more likely to experience some tension and dissatisfaction with the existing condition.

9. Differences in the level of parent involvement in the improving and declining schools are not clear cut. It seems that there is less overall parent involvement in the improving schools; however, the improving school staffs indicated that their schools have higher levels of parent initiated involvement. This suggests that we need to look more closely at the nature of the involvement exercised by parents. Perhaps parent initiated contact with the schools represents an effective instrument of educational change.

10. The compensatory education program data suggests differences between improving and declining schools, but these differences may be distorted by the fact that one of the declining schools had just initiated a compensatory education program. In general, the improving schools are not characterized by a high emphasis upon paraprofessional staff, nor heavy involvement of the regular teachers in the selection of students to be placed in compensatory education programs. The declining schools seem to have a greater number of different staff involved in reading instruction and more teacher involvement in identifying students who are to be placed in compensatory education programs. The regular classroom teachers in the declining schools report spending more time planning for non-compensatory education reading activities. The decliners also report greater emphasis on programmed instruction."[45]

Before making summary remarks about the policy import of these several studies I want to say something of my own research, "Search for Effective Schools: The Identification and Analysis of City Schools That Are Instructionally Effective for Poor Children."[46] This discussion will describe our ongoing efforts to indentify and analyze city schools that are instructionally effective for poor and/or

minority children. I am pleased to note that we have already developed unusually persuasive evidence of the thesis we seek to demonstrate in the research under discussion. Our thesis is that all children are eminently educable, and the behavior of the school is critical in determining the quality of that education.

The "Search for Effective Schools" project began by answering the question: "Are there schools that are instructionally effective for poor children?" In September of 1974, Lezotte, Edmonds, and Ratner described their analysis of pupil performance in the twenty elementary schools that make up Detroit's Model Cities Neighborhood.[47] All of the schools are located in inner-city Detroit and serve a predominantly poor and minority pupil population. Reading and math scores were analyzed from Detroit's Spring 1973 use of the Stanford Achievement Test and the Iowa Test of Basic Skills. Of the 10,000 pupils in the twenty schools in the Model Cities' Neighborhood, 2500 were randomly sampled. With minor variation, the sample included eight pupils per classroom in each of the twenty schools. The mean math and reading scores for the twenty schools were compared with citywide norms. An effective school among the twenty was defined as being at or above the city average grade equivalent in math and reading. An ineffective school was defined as below the city average. Using these criteria, eight of the twenty schools were judged effective in teaching math. Nine were judged effective in teaching reading and five were judged effective in teaching both math and reading.

We turned next to the problem of establishing the relationship

between pupil family background and building effectiveness. Two schools among the twenty, Duffield and Bunche, were found that were matched on the basis of eleven social indicators. Duffield pupils averaged nearly four months above the city average in reading and math. Bunche pupils averaged nearly three months below the city reading average and 1.5 months below the city math average.

The similarity in the characteristics of the two pupil populations permits us to infer the importance of school behavior in making pupil performance independent of family background. The overriding point here is that, in and of itself, pupil family background neither causes nor precludes elementary school instructional effectiveness.

Despite the value of our early work in Detroit, we recognized the limitations of the Model Cities' Neighborhood analysis. Our evaluation of school success with poor children had depended on evaluating schools with relatively homogeneous pupil populations. The numbers of schools were too few to justify firm conclusions. Finally, the achievement tests were normative, as was the basis for determining building effectiveness among the twenty schools. Even so, valuable lessons were learned in Detroit from which we would later greatly profit.

The second phase of the project was a reanalysis of the 1966 Equal Educational Opportunity Survey (EEOS) data.[48] Our purpose was to answer a number of research questions that required a data base both larger and richer than had been available to us in the Model Cities' Neighborhood analysis. We retained our interest in identifying instructionally effective schools for the poor, but in

between pupil family background and building effectiveness. Two schools among the twenty, Duffield and Bunche, were found that were matched on the basis of eleven social indicators. Duffield pupils averaged nearly four months above the city average in reading and math. Bunche pupils averaged nearly three months below the city reading average and 1.5 months below the city math average.

The similarity in the characteristics of the two pupil populations permits us to infer the importance of school behavior in making pupil performance independent of family background. The overriding point here is that, in and of itself, pupil family background neither causes nor precludes elementary school instructional effectiveness.

Despite the value of our early work in Detroit, we recognized the limitations of the Model Cities' Neighborhood analysis. Our evaluation of school success with poor children had depended on evaluating schools with relatively homogeneous pupil populations. The numbers of schools were too few to justify firm conclusions. Finally, the achievement tests were normative, as was the basis for determining building effectiveness among the twenty schools. Even so, valuable lessons were learned in Detroit from which we would later greatly profit.

The second phase of the project was a reanalysis of the 1966 Equal Educational Opportunity Survey (EEOS) data.[48] Our purpose was to answer a number of research questions that required a data base both larger and richer than had been available to us in the Model Cities' Neighborhood analysis. We retained our interest in identifying instructionally effective schools for the poor, but in

addition we wanted to study the effects of schools on children having different social backgrounds. Such an inquiry would permit us to evaluate school contributions to educational outcomes independent of our ability to match schools on the basis of the socioeconomic characteristics of their pupils.

Summarizing and oversimplifying results, we found at least 55 effective schools in the Northeast quadrant of the EEOS. Our summary definition of school effectiveness required that each school eliminate the relationship between successful performance and family background. The effective schools varied widely in racial composition, per pupil expenditure, and other presumed determinants of school quality.

In our re-analysis of the EEOS, separate evaluations of the schools were made for subgroups of pupils of different races and home backgrounds. Schools were found to be consistently effective (or ineffective) in teaching subgroups of their populations that were homogeneous in race and economic condition. These schools were not found to be consistently effective in teaching children of differing economic condition and race. School effectiveness for a given level on Coleman's home items scale extended across racial lines. The prime factors which condition a school's instructional effectiveness appear to be principally economic and social, rather than racial.

Without seeking to match effective and ineffective schools on mean social background variables, we found that the schools that were instructionally effective for poor and black children were indistinguishable from the instructionally less effective

schools on measures of pupil social background (mean father's and mother's education, category of occupation, percentage of white students, mean family size, and percentage of intact families). The large differences in performance between the effective and ineffective schools could not therefore be attributed to differences in the social class and family background of pupils enrolled in the schools. This finding is in striking contrast to that of other analysts of the EEOS, who have generally concluded that variability in performance levels from school to school is only minimally related to institutional characteristics.

A very great proportion of the American people believe that family background and home environment are principal causes of the quality of pupil performance. In fact, no notion about schooling is more widely held than the belief that the family is somehow principal determinant of whether or not a child will do well in school. The popularity of that belief continues partly because many social scientists and opinion makers continue to espouse the belief that family background is chief cause of the quality of pupil performance. Such a belief has the effect of absolving educators of their professional responsibility to be instructionally effective.

While recognizing the importance of family background in developing a child's character, personality, and intelligence, I cannot overemphasize my rejection of the notion that a school is relieved of its instructional obligations when teaching the children of the poor. I reject such a notion partly because I recognize

the existence of schools that successfully teach basic school skills to all children. Such success occurs partly because these schools are determined to serve all their pupils without regard to family background. At the same time, these schools recognize the necessity of modifying curricular design, text selection, teaching strategy, etc., in response to differences in family background among pupils in the school. Our findings strongly recommend that all schools be held responsible for effectively teaching basic school skills to all children. We recommend future studies of school and teacher effectiveness consider the stratification design as a means for investigating the separate relationship of programs and policies for pupils of differing family and social background. Information about individual student family background and social class is essential in our analysis if we are to disentangle the separate effects of pupil background and school social class make-up on pupil achievement. Moreover, studies of school effectiveness should be multivariate in character and employ longitudinal records of pupil achievement in a variety of areas of school learning.

The "Search for Effective Schools Project" is now completing its analysis of social class, family background, and pupil performance for all Lansing, Michigan pupils in grades three through seven. We have identified five Lansing schools in which achievement seems independent of pupil social class. The achievement data are: local and normative; and state and criterion. We use both sets of data to identify schools in which all pupils are achieving beyond minimum objectives including most especially those children

of low social class and poverty family background. We are now gathering similar data for Detroit pupils in the elementary grades in schools whose pupil population is at least 15% poor.

The on-site study of Lansing's effective schools as compared to ineffective schools is scheduled to commence during the 1978-79 school year. Our basic notions of the character and origin of effective and ineffective school differences derives from work we've already done in combination with ideas on school effects that I've held for a long time.[49] On the basis of the review of the literature in this paper and the "Effective Schools" project's earlier study in Detroit Model Cities and EEOS's Northeast quadrant I would offer the following with respect to the distinguishing characteristics of schools that are instructionally effective for poor children.

What effective schools share is a climate in which it is incumbent on all personnel to be instructionally effective for all pupils. That is not of course a very profound insight but it does define the proper lines of research inquiry.

What ought to be focused on are questions such as: What is the origin of that climate of instructional responsibility; if it dissipates what causes it to do so; it if remains what keeps it functioning? Our tentative answers are these. Some schools are instructionally effective for the poor because they have a tyrannical principal who compels the teachers to bring all children to a minimum level of mastery of basic skills. Some schools are effective because they have a self-generating teacher corps that has a critical mass of dedicated people who are

committed to be effective for all the children they teach. Some schools are effective because they have a highly politicized Parent Teacher Organization that holds the schools to close instructional account. The point here is to make clear at the outset that no one model explains school effectiveness for the poor or any other social class subset. Fortunately children know how to learn in more ways than we know how to teach thus permitting great latitude in choosing instructional strategy. The great problem in schooling is that we know how to teach in ways that can keep some children from learning most anything and we often choose to thus proceed when dealing with the children of the poor.

Thus one of the cardinal characteristics of effective schools is that they are as anxious to avoid things that don't work as they are committed to implementing things that do.

I want to close this by discussing as unequivocally as I can what seem to me the most tangible and indispensable characteristics of effective schools. They have strong administrative leadership without which the disparate elements of good schooling can be neither brought together nor kept together. Schools that are instructionally effective for poor children have a climate of expectation in which no children are permitted to fall below minimum but efficacious levels of achievement. The school's atmosphere is orderly without being rigid, quiet without being oppressive, and generally conducive to the instructional business at hand. Effective schools get that way partly by making it clear that pupil acquisition of

basic school skills takes precedence over all other school activities. When necessary school energy and resources can be diverted from other busin ss in furtherance of the fundamental objectives. The final effective school characteristic to be set down is that there must be some means by which pupil progress can be frequently monitored. These means may be as traditional as classroom testing on the day's lesson or as advanced as criterion referenced systemwide standardized measures. The point is that some means must exist in the school by which the principal and the teachers remain constantly aware of pupil progress in relationship to instructional objectives.

Two final points: first, how many effective schools would you have to see to be persuaded of the educability of poor children? If your answer is more than one then I submit that you have reasons of your own for preferring to believe that basic pupil performance derives from family background instead of school response to family background. Second, whether or not we will ever effectively teach the children of the poor is probably far more a matter of politics than of social science and that is as it should be. While it may be improbable that our politics will ever bring us to educational equity for the poor it is inconceivable that NIE (National Institute of Education) or AERA (American Educational Research Association) should do so. What I am therefore suggesting is that if you genuinely seek the means to educational equity for all our people you must encourage parent attention to politics as the greatest instrument of instructional reform extant . You must not for an instant suggest that social science as practiced in AERA or

as subsidized at NIE will advance the equity interests of the poor. I mention AERA and NIE in this slightly disparaging manner for two reasons. First, their contribution to our national discourse on educational equity graphically illustrates my point that the poor are far more likely to be served by politics than by any equity interests to be found in the educational research establishment. Second, I simply mean here to suggest that social service enterprises like NIE are not substantively different from the schools whose study has been the object of this paper. Left to their own devices, social services serve those they think they must and that does not often include the children of the poor. This is not meant to suggest that NIE does not support socially useful projects carried out by men and women of both substance and merit. It is merly meant to suggest that those who get NIE money will, more often than is helpful for our purposes, be white, and of very conventional social science wisdom. Being white and of conventional wisdom is not of course an intrinsic disability. The combination does however preclude repudiation of those of our social science notions that are most pernicious when discussing school reform. Repudiation of the social science notion that family background is principal cause of pupil acquisition of basic school skills is probably prerequisite to successful reform of public schooling for the children of the poor.

It seems to me therefore that what is left of this discussion are three declarative statements. We can whenever, and wherever we choose, successfully teach all children whose schooling is of interest to us. We already know more than we need, to do what I just said. Whether or not we do it must finally depend on how we feel about the fact that we haven't so far.

Footnotes

1. Coleman, J.S., Campbell, E.O., Hobson, C.J., McPartland, J., Mood, A.M., Weinfeld, F.D., & York, R.L. Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington, D.C. : U.S. Office of Education, National Center for Educational Statistics, 1966.

2. Katz, Michael B. "Education and Inequality: An Historical Perspective." Russell Sage Foundation, May, 1977.

Greer, Colin. "How Schools Began to Care About Learning", Social Policy, V.8, No. 2, September, 1977.

2a. Tyler, Ralph. "Fifty Years of Theory and Practice" Social Policy, V.8, No. 2, September 1977.

3. Katz, Michael B. "Education and Inequality..."

Tyack, D.B. The One Best System.

4. Katz, Michael B. "Education and Inequality. . ."

5. Armour, D.J. " Equality of Educational Opportunity: The Basic Findings Reconsidered. " In Mosteller, F. & Moynihan, D.P., On Equality of Educational Opportunity. New York: Rardom House, 1972.

6. Bowles, S., & Levin, H.M. " The determinants of scholastic achievement—An appraisal of some recent evidence. " Journal of Human Resources, 1968, 3, 3-24.

7. Cain, G.G., & Watts, H.W. " Problems in making policy inferences from the Coleman Report. " American Sociological Review, 1970, 35, 228-242.

8. Hanushek, E., & Kain, J.F. "On the Value of Equality of Educational Opportunity as a Guide to Public Policy." In Mosteller, F. & Moynihan, D.P. On Equality of Educational Opportunity. New York: Random House, 1972.

9. Jencks, C.S. "The Coleman Report and the Conventional Wisdom." In Mosteller, F. & Moynihan, D.P. On Equality of Educational Opportunity. New York, Random House, 1972.

10. Smith, M.S. "Equality of Educational Opportunity: The Basic Findings Reconsidered." In Mosteller, F., & Moynihan, D.P. On Equality of Educational Opportunity. New York: Random House, 1972.

11. Gordon, H. "Mental and Scholastic Tests Among Retarded Children." Education Pamphlet #44. London Board of Education, 1923.

12. Green, R.L., Hoffman, L.J. and Morgan, R.F. The Educational Status of Children During the First Year Following Four Years of Little or No Schooling. Michigan State University, 1966.

13. Wheeler, L.R. "A Comparative Study of the Intelligence of Eastern Tennessee Mountain Children." Journal of Educational Psychology, 1942. V.33, pp. 321-334.

14. Mayeske, G.W., Okada, T., Beaton, A.E. Jr., Cohen, W.M., and Wisler, C.E. A Study of the Achievement of our Nation's Students. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972.

15. State of New York, Office of Education Performance Review. School Factors Influencing Reading Achievement: A Case Study of Two Inner City Schools. March, 1974.

16. Weber, G. Inner-City Children Can Be Taught to Read: Four Successful Schools. Washington, D.C.: Council for Basic Education, 1971.

17. Averch, H.A., Carroll, S.J., Donaldson, T.S., Kiesling, H.J., and Pincus J. How effective is schooling? A critical review and synthesis of research findings. Santa Monica, California: The Rand Corporation, 1972.

18. Rist, R.C. "Student social class and teacher expectations: The self-fulfilling prophecy in ghetto education." Harvard Educational Review, 1970, 40, 411-451.

19. Brophy, J.E., and Good, T.L. "Teacher's communication of Differential Expectations for Children's Classroom Performance." Journal of Educational Psychology, 1970, 61, 365-374.

20. Edmonds, R.R., and Frederiksen, J.R. "Search for Effective Schools: The Identification and Analysis of City Schools That Are Instructionally Effective for Poor Children." Center for Urban Studies, Harvard University, Cambridge, 1978.

21. Purves, A.C., and Levine, D.U. Educational Policy and International Assessment. McCutchan, 1975.

22. Walker

22a. op.cit. Parves and Levine, Educational Policy..... pp.

23. USOE, Title I Evaluation (1970).

24. USOE, Title I Evaluation (1975).

25. Westinghouse/Ohio University. Cicirelli, et al. 1969.

26. Williams and Evan, 1972.

Smith and Bissell, 1970.

McDill et al, 1972.

Madow, 1969.

27. N.Y. Times, Sunday, April 30, 1978.

28. Jencks, C. et al. Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America. Basic Books, 1972.

29. Edmonds, R. et al. "A Black Response to Christopher Jencks's Inequality and Certain Other Issues." Harvard Educational Review, N. 43, No.1, 1973.

30. "What the Research Studies Show." The N.Y. Times, Sunday, November 13, 1977 pp.

OP CIT WEBER, G. p. 30

31. Ibid.

OP CIT AVERCH, H.A. etal pp. 154-158

32. Bolner, J. and Shanley, R. Busing: The Political and Judicial Process. Praeger, 1974.

33. Edmonds, R.; Cheng, C.; Newby, R. "Desegregation Planning and Educational Equity: Prospects and Possibilities." In Press. Theory Into Practice. V. XVII, No.1, February 1978.

Edmonds, R. "Simple Justice in the Cradle of Liberty: Desegregating the Boston Public Schools." In Press. Vanderbilt Law Review.

Teele, J. Evaluating School Busing. Praeger, 1973.

34. Edmonds, R. "Desegregation and Equity: Community Perspectives." Harvard Graduate School of Education Association Bulletin. 19, No. 2, Winter, 1974-75.

35. St. John, Nancy H. School Desegregation: Outcomes for Children. Wiley, 1975.

36. Op Cit. Weber, G. Inner City Children Can Be Taught to Read.

37. Jensen, A. "How Much Can We Boost IQ and Scholastic Achievement?" Harvard Educational Review, Winter, 1969.

38. Op cit. State of New York. School Factors Influencing Reading Achievement.

39. Ibid., pp. vi and vii.

40. Madden, J.V.; Lawson, D.R.; Sweet, D. "School Effectiveness Study: State of California" 1976.

41. Ibid.

42. Brookover, W.B., Lezotte, L.W. "Changes In School Characteristics Coincident With Changes In Student Achievement." College of Urban Development of Michigan State University and The Michigan Department of Education, 1977.

43. Research Evaluation and Assessment Services of the Michigan Department of Education. Report of the 1974-75 Michigan Cost Effectiveness Study. Capital Publications, 1976.

44. Brookover, W. et al. "Elementary School Climate and School Achievement". College of Urban Development of Michigan State University, 1976.

45. Op Cit. Brookover and Lezotte. "Changes in School Characteristics..."

46. Op Cit. Edmonds and Frederiksen. "Search for Effective Schools..."

47. Lezotte, Larry; Edmonds, Ronald, and Ratner, Gershon. "Remedy for School Failure to Equitably Deliver Basic School Skills." Center for Urban Studies, Harvard University, Cambridge, Ma., 1974.

48. Frederiksen, John. "School Effectiveness and Equality of Educational Opportunity." Center for Urban Studies, Harvard University, 1975.

49. Edmonds, R.R. "Alternative Patterns for the Distribution of Social Services." Equality and Social Policy, Walter Feinberg, ed. University of Illinois Press, 1978.

REFERENCES

Armour, D.J. "Equality of Educational Opportunity: The Basic Findings Reconsidered." In Mosteller, F. & Moynihan, D.P. On Equality of Educational Opportunity. New York: Random House, 1972.

Averch, H.A., Carroll, S.J., Donaldson, T.S., Kiesling, H.J., and Pincus, J. How Effective is Schooling? A Critical Review and Synthesis of Research Findings. Santa Monica, California: The Rand Corporation, 1972.

Bolner, J. and Shanley, R. Busing: The Political and Judicial Process. Praeger, 1974.

Bowles, S. & Levin, H.M. "The Determinants of Scholastic Achievement— An Appraisal of Some Recent Evidence." Journal of Human Resources, 1968, 3, 3-24.

Brookover, W.B., Lezotte, L.W. "Changes In School Characteristics Coincident with Changes in Student Achievement." College of Urban Development of Michigan State University and the Michigan Department of Education, 1977.

Brookover, W. et al. "Elementary School Climate and School Achievement." College of Urban Development of Michigan State University, 1976.

Brophy, J.E. and Good, T.L. "Teacher's Communication of Differential Expectations for Children's Classroom Performance." Journal of Educational Psychology, 1970, 61, 365-374.

Cain, G.G., & Watts, H.W. "Problems in Making Policy Inferences from the Coleman Report." American Sociological Review, 1970, 35, 228-242.

Coleman, J.S., Campbell, E.Q., Hobson, C.J., McPartland, J., Mood, A.M., Weinfeld, F.D., & York, R.L. Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, National Center for Educational Statistics, 1966.

Edmonds, R.R. "Alternative Patterns for the Distribution of Social Services." Equality and Social Policy, Walter Feinberg, ed. University of Illinois Press, 1978.

Edmonds, R. "Desegregation and Equity: Community Perspectives." Harvard Graduate School of Education Association Bulletin. 19, No. 2, Winter, 1974-75.

Edmonds, R. "Simple Justice in the Cradle of Liberty: Desegregating the Boston Public Schools." In Press. Vanderbilt Law Review.

Edmonds, R. et al. "A Black Response to Christopher Jenck's Inequality and Certain Other Issues." Harvard Educational Review, V. 43, No. 1, 1973.

Edmonds, R.; Cheng, C.; Newby, R. "Desegregation Planning and Educational Equity: Prospects and Possibilities." Theory Into Practice. V. XVII, No. 1, February, 1978.

Edmonds, R.R., and Frederiksen, J.R. "Search for Effective Schools: The Identification and Analysis of City Schools That Are Instructionally Effective for Poor Children." Center for Urban Studies, Harvard University, Cambridge, 1978.

Frederiksen, John. "School Effectiveness and Equality of Educational Opportunity." Center for Urban Studies, Harvard University, 1975.

Gordon, H. "Mental and Scholastic Tests Among Retarded Children." Education Pamphlet #44. London Board of Education, 1923.

Green, R.L.; Hoffman, L.J.; Morse, R.J.; and Morgan, R.F. The Educational Status of Children During the First Year Following Four Years of Little or No Schooling. Michigan State University, 1966.

Greer, Colin. "How Schools Began to Care About Learning." Social Policy, V.8, No. 2, September, 1977.

Hanushek, E., & Kain, J.F. "On the Value of Equality of Educational Opportunity as a Guide to Public Policy." In Mosteller, F. & Moynihan,D.P. On Equality of Educational Opportunity. New York: Random House, 1972.

Jencks, C. et al. Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America. Basic Books, 1972.

Jencks, C.S. "The Coleman Report and the Conventional Wisdom." In Mosteller, F. & Moynihan, D.P. On Equality of Educational Opportunity. New York: Random House, 1972.

Jensen, A. "How Much Can We Boost IQ and Scholastic Achievement?" Harvard Educational Review, Winter, 1969.

Katz, Michael B. "Education and Inequality: An Historical Perspective." Russell Sage Foundation, May, 1977.

Lezotte, Larry; Edmonds, Ronald, and Ratner, Gershon. "Remedy for School Failure to Equitably Deliver Basic School Skills." Center for Urban Studies, Harvard University, Cambridge, 1974.

Madden, J.V.; Lawson, D.R.; Sweet, D. "School Effectiveness Study: State of California." 1976.

Madow, 1969.

Mayeske, G.W.; Okada, T.; Beaton, A.E. Jr.; Cohen, W.M.; and Wisler, C.E. A Study of the Achievement of our Nation's Students. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972.

McDill et al, 1972.

New York Times, Sunday, April 30, 1978.

New York Times, Sunday, Nov. 13, 1977. "What the Research Studies Show."

Purves, A.C. and Levine, D.U. Educational Policy and International Assessment. McCutchan, 1975.

Research Evaluation and Assessment Services of the Michigan Department of Education. Report of the 1974-75 Michigan Cost Effectiveness Study. Capital Publications, 1976.

Rist, R.C. "Student Social Class and Teacher Expectations: The Self-Fulfilling Prophecy in Ghetto Education. Harvard Educational Review, 1970, 40, 411-451.

St. John, Nancy H. School Desegregation: Outcomes for Children. Wiley, 1975.

Smith and Bissell, 1970.

Smith, M.S. "Equality of Educational Opportunity: The Basic Findings Reconsidered." In Mosteller, F., & Moynihan, D.P. On Equality of Educational Opportunity. New York: Random House, 1972.

State of New York, Office of Education Performance Review. School Factors Influencing Reading Achievement: A Case Study of Two Inner City Schools. March, 1974.

Teele, J. Evaluating School Busing. Praeger, 1973.

Tyack, D.B. The One Best System. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, 1974.

Tyler, Ralph. "Fifty Years of Theory and Practice." Social Policy, V. 8, No. 2, September 1977.

USOE, Title I Evaluation (1970).

USOE, Title I Evaluation (1975).

Walker.

Weber, G. Inner-City Children Can Be Taught to Read: Four Successful Schools. Washington, D.C.: Council for Basic Education, 1971.

Westinghouse/Ohio University. Cicirelli, et al. 1969.

Wheeler, L.R. "A Comparative Study of the Intelligence of Eastern Tennessee Mountain Children." Journal of Educational Psychology. 1942. V.33, pp.321-334.

Williams and Evan, 1972.